

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement? | | X | | | |
| 2. Affecting existing parking facilities, or create a demand for new parking? | | X | | | |
| 3. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems? | | X | | | |
| 4. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods? | X | | | | |
| 5. Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic? | X | | | | |
| 6. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians? | X | | | | |

Explanation:

1.) If the lease is renewed, traffic would remain at or near current levels for another ten years. If the lease is denied, some unknown increase in truck traffic could be generated, as well as new rail traffic, to replace the stocks currently provided by water transport.

2.) All staff parking for both facilities is currently on the grounds of the upland facility, which would not change under either a denial or approval scenario.

3.) The renewal of the lease would continue current levels of use of existing transportation systems, including the potential for an accident which could have a significant impact on water-borne commerce. If the lease were denied there would be an unknown increase in truck, and possibly rail, traffic in the region to replace the lost water transport. This change could have significant impacts, depending on the mix of transportation modes finally adopted.

4.) Renewal of the lease continues present patterns of circulation. Denial of the lease would shift petroleum product transport from tankers and barges to some unknown combination of pipeline, rail and truck transport.

5.) As discussed above, renewal of the lease has no impact; denial has an unknown, but possibly significant impact.

6.) Renewal of the lease would not change current patterns, but denial could generate increased truck traffic that would interact with motor vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians.